

**DCSS P3 PROJECT
CUSTOMER ACCESS WORKGROUP
OCTOBER 25, 2000
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Wednesday, October 25, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Customer Access Workgroup held its last official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Bill Kirk, State Co-Leader (DCSS Supervisor)
- ☐ Corilynn Breitwisch, County Co-Leader (DIC Call Center---Los Angeles)
- ☒ Lucila Rolon, State Analyst (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Robert Bash, County Analyst (Manager---Tulare)
- ☐ Faye Thomas, Small County Rep (Director---Amador)
- ☒ Dianne Seno, Medium County Rep (Supervisor---Ventura)
- ☒ David Norwood, Large County Rep (Supervisor---San Diego)
- ☐ Rumyana Tassev, Advocate (ACES Leader)
- ☒ Betty Nordwind, Advocate (Executive Director---Harriett Buhai Center)
- ☐ Connie Jimenez, Judicial Council Rep (Facilitator---Santa Clara)
- ☐ Ron Dotta, FTB Rep (CAMP)
- ☒ Sandy Trigg, FTB Rep (CCSAS Information Systems Analyst)
- ☐ Ed Kent, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☐ Judi Bentzen, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Renee Bastian, CSAC Rep (CAO Analyst---San Bernardino)
- ☒ Marilyn Mirano (Orange County Family Law Facilitator)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Larry Wilson, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Nora O'Brien, Advocate (ACES)
- ☐ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE---Region 9)
- ☐ John Schambre, Resource (OCSE---Region 9)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dcss.ca.gov.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

There was no discussion of the minutes from the previous session.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Larry walked through the agenda for today's session. The topics included:

- Review the calendar of events for the next two months.
- Develop the cost and benefit evaluation for each recommendation
- Identify “Next Steps” for inclusion in Chapter 5 of the Draft Final Report.
- Review questions and answers from the public forums, including answering any that have yet to be answered.
- Review comments from OCSE and the Steering Committee meeting of October 3 as input to the Customer Access Draft Final Report.
- Review the emerging Draft Final Report and make any changes before the report moves into the quality assurance processes.
- Identify at least two people who will be the ongoing resources to review the report following the various stages of change.
- Identify at least two people who will be ongoing resources to DCSS on the subject of customer access.

D. SAN LUIS OBISPO FORUM

Larry gave a brief overview of the proceedings at the San Luis Obispo forum. There were over 100 questions asked and answered. It was an excellent exchange of information and all the presenters again did very well in presenting their topics. The presenters also did very well in answering all questions with knowledge and a sense of authority.

E. CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Larry discussed the next two forums and the Steering Committee dates. There also was discussion about how new information and questions will be incorporated into the Final Draft Report.

F. COST BENEFIT EVALUATION

The group examined each recommendation and assigned a notional level of cost and a notional level of benefit or return on investment. There was good dialogue on each recommendation, and the group arrived at consensus on all but two items. In those two instances, the variance is noted in the rating. These can be viewed in the Cost and Benefit Evaluation Matrix attached to these minutes.

G. WORKGROUP DRAFT REPORT

The group compared the Intermediate Work Product report to the version 7 report and made the following changes:

- **Acknowledgment**
No changes
- **Workgroup Membership**
Julie Hopkins, SRA International E-mail address: Change dss to dcss
Bill Kirk - Change to William ...E-mail address: Change dss to dcss
Lucila - E-mail address: Change dss to dcss

- **Executive Summary**
Add Recommendation #1 - under Policy for Counties →Customer Service Liaison
Policy Recommendation for DCSS - Change wording for Item #4
- **Chapter 2 – The Process**
No change.
- **Chapter 3 – Results and Recommendations**
Larry will give editing notes to Lucila
Recommendation #4 -regular statewide public education
Add wording such as: Expertise to provide guidance in the development of the program, materials for distribution and education and assist in defining the success criteria for public education program...
- **Chapter4 - Cost/Benefit Matrix**
In the final version of the report, Chapter 4 will become the Cost/Benefit matrix.
- **Chapter 5 - Next Steps**
No changes.

H. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES

None identified.

I. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

None identified.

J. HANDOUTS

None.

K. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- Reneé will email to Larry the consolidated Workgroup answers to Judicial Council questions.
- Larry will send to Lucila the combined set of meeting minutes for inclusion as App. A.
- Larry will send to Lucila the soft copy of the Cost/Benefit Matrix for inclusion as Chapter 4.
- Larry will send to Lucila the revised Chapter 1 and the Questions and Answers from the forums held to date for inclusion as Appendix B.
- Lucila will make the changes to the Draft Final Report and forward that to Larry and Julie on October 31.

L. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

None identified.

M. ATTACHMENTS

Cost/Benefit Matrix.

N. OTHER NOTES

Agenda Item 5 – Pictures

Pictures will be taken at a later date. Plans are to schedule an “all workgroup session” in January to discuss what will happen with recommendations.

Agenda Item 6 - Ongoing Resource Pool

Lucila Rolon, Bill Kirk, Sandy Trigg, David Norwood, Dianne Seno, Robert Bash, Marilyn Mirano, and Renee Bastian agreed to serve. Lucila will contact those members that were not present to see if they are interested in being part of resource pool.

Agenda Item 7 - Peer Review Group

Lucila Rolon, Corilynn Breitwisch, Bill Kirk, and Robert Bash will be ongoing members of the Peer Review Group.

Agenda Item 8 - Steering Committee Comments from the October 3 Meeting

Next Tuesday, there will be a discussion about the details of the Steering Committee meeting and who should attend from the Workgroups.

Agenda Item 9 - Department of Health and Human Services - John Schambre Comments

Comments will be addressed in the Draft Final Report.

Final Editing

The Draft Final Report will be forwarded to members after editing by SRA staff.

ATTACHMENT Cost/Benefit Evaluation Notes

Policy Recommendations – DCSS

1. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
 2. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
 3. \$\$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺
 4. Change wording: “Conduct regular statewide public education....”
\$\$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺
 5. \$ ☺ ☺
 6. \$ ☺ ☺
 7. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
- Survey must be easily understood
Maximize use of technology
Survey must be set up so that information gleaned is meaningful
Take advantage of existing tools and resources available

Policy Recommendations – Counties

1. \$ ☺ ☺
2. \$\$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺
- These consider the whole matrix, not a singular or group of items in the matrix
3. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺

Best Practices – Counties

1. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
2. \$\$ ☺ ☺
3. \$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺
4. \$\$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺
5. \$\$ ☺ ☺ ☺

California Legislation

1. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
2. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺
3. \$ ☺ ☺ ☺

Caveats and explanations to clarify how we came to our cost/benefit results for each group of recommendations.

Customer Access Workgroup

Cost/Benefit Evaluation October 25, 2000

Recommendation	Cost (H, M, L)	Benefit/ROI (H, M, L)
Policy Recommendations for DCSS		
Adopt the mission to supply all child support customers with timely and easy access to consistent, accurate, current, and complete information in a professional and courteous manner.	\$	☺☺☺
1. Adopt an understanding that there is a broad range of customers, consisting of four main customer groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants, including custodial and non-custodial parents and their attorneys or representatives • Employers and financial institutions • Government, including elected officials, other departments, judicial officers and other local child support agencies (LCSAs) • General public 	\$	☺☺☺
2. Given the resource-intensive nature of customer service, commit to funding adequate resources, including expert training, for LCSAs.	\$\$\$	☺☺☺
3. Conduct regular statewide public education in order to adequately educate and inform the public regarding child support and the statewide services available.	\$\$\$	☺☺☺
4. Appoint a Customer Access Task Force to continue and enhance customer service activities.	\$	☺☺
5. Review the benefits and feasibility of a statewide Customer Contact Center, to be implemented as a long-range goal, as other statewide systems evolve.	\$	☺☺
Implement a statewide customer service survey program to provide input to the Customer Access Task Force, and to contribute to program evaluation and improvement.	\$/\$\$	☺☺☺
Policy Recommendations for Counties		
1. Designate a Customer Service Liaison within each county and relevant state organization.	\$	☺☺
2. Meet customer service standards as outlined in a table developed by the Customer Access Workgroup.	\$\$\$	☺☺☺*
3. Local child support agencies will participate in regular customer service training provided by the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS).	\$	☺☺☺

Recommendation	Cost (H, M, L)	Benefit/ROI (H, M, L)
Best Practices		
1. Conduct customer service surveys on a regular basis.	\$	☺☺☺
2. Offer extended hours/days of service to better accommodate client needs.	\$\$	☺☺
3. Provide multiple avenues of access for customer convenience.	\$\$	☺☺☺
4. Provide standardized public education and outreach programs directed at customer groups.	\$\$\$	☺☺☺
5. Provide regular and consistent customer service training that is delivered by experts to ensure that both state and LCSA staff have necessary tools and information.	\$\$	☺☺☺
California Legislation		
General Customer Service Resource Funding	\$	☺☺☺
Change State Investment Fund Rules	\$	☺☺☺
Additional Funding for Customer Access Projects	\$	☺☺☺

* Note: In assessing the potential costs and benefits of this recommendation, the entire set of recommended customer service options was considered as a whole rather than as isolated initiatives.